

1 MCGREGOR W. SCOTT  
United States Attorney  
2 MIRIAM R. HINMAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 501 I Street, Suite 10-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
4 Telephone: (916) 554-2700  
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900  
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America  
7

8  
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12  
13 Plaintiff,  
14  
15 v.  
16 STEVEN MICHAEL ROBERTS,  
17 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-CR-007 JAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
FINDINGS AND ORDER

DATE: June 9, 2020  
TIME: 9:15 a.m.  
COURT: Hon. John A. Mendez

17 This case is set for a status conference on June 9, 2020. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued  
18 General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further  
19 notice.” Further, pursuant to General Order 611, this Court’s declaration of judicial emergency under 18  
20 U.S.C. § 3174, and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council’s Order of April 16, 2020 continuing this Court’s  
21 judicial emergency, this Court has allowed district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after  
22 May 2, 2021.<sup>1</sup> This and previous General Orders, as well as the declarations of judicial emergency,  
23 were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

24 Although the General Orders and declarations of emergency address the district-wide health  
25 concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision  
26 “counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> A judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” at the discretion of that judge “or upon the  
request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order  
will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020).

findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 and the subsequent declaration of judicial emergency require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

The General Orders and declaration of judicial emergency exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>2</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date

---

<sup>2</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D. Cal. March 18, 2020).

for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

**STIPULATION**

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on June 9, 2020.

2. By this stipulation, defendant now moves to continue the status conference until July 21, 2020 at 9:15 a.m., and to exclude time between June 9, 2020, and July 21, 2020, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].

3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

a) On January 16, 2020, the government produced four disks of discovery to defense counsel, which included documents, photos, and audio and video recordings.

b) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to review the discovery and to meet with her client about the case. The defendant was released to a 90-day residential treatment program on March 2, 2020, which he completed on June 1, 2020. He has just been released from treatment. Counsel for the defendant informed the government that the defendant’s participation in the treatment program has made communication between counsel and the defendant difficult, and the defendant has been focused on completing his treatment program. As described below, the COVID-19 pandemic has also been making it difficult for defense counsel to meet with her client.

c) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

d) The government does not object to the continuance.

e) In addition to the public health concerns cited by the General Orders and declarations of judicial emergency, and presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in this case because the combination of the pandemic and the defendant’s participation in residential drug treatment has delayed counsel’s ability to

1 become familiar with the case and her client. State and local public health orders have directed  
2 residents of Sacramento County to minimize personal contacts. Defense counsel wishes to  
3 conduct further in-person meetings with her client to discuss the case and go over documents.

4 f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
5 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
6 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

7 g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
8 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of June 9, 2020 to July 21, 2020,  
9 inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4]  
10 because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of  
11 the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest  
12 of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

13 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
14 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
15 must commence.

16  
17 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

18  
19  
20 Dated: June 3, 2020

McGREGOR W. SCOTT  
United States Attorney

21  
22 /s/ MIRIAM R. HINMAN  
MIRIAM R. HINMAN  
23 Assistant United States Attorney

24  
25  
26 Dated: June 3, 2020

27 /s/ CHRISTINA SINHA  
CHRISTINA SINHA  
28 Counsel for Defendant  
Steven Michael Roberts

**FINDINGS AND ORDER**

IT IS SO FOUND AND ORDERED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2020.

/s/ John A. Mendez

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE